

## **REMARKS**

### **Introduction**

The remarks are responsive to the non-final Office Action of May 12, 2004. Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1-5, 10-12, 19, 21-23, 25 and 26 have been editorially amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

### **Objections**

The Office Action objected to claims 5, 10, 11, and 25 for formal matters. Specifically, the office action cites the term "said keys" in claims 5, 10, and 11 as being unclear. Accordingly, claims 5, 10, and 11 have been amended to specify "said remote control keys." In Claim 25 the phrase "in the keyboard housing includes is foldable" was objected to as having missing language. Thus, claim 25 is now amended to read "in which the keyboard housing is foldable." Applicant respectfully submits that objections to claims 5, 10, 11, and 25 are now moot.

Claims 21-22 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant requests the objection be withdrawn in light of the amended claims.

### **Claims**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 6, 9, 12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Japanese Patent Application No. 10-207605A to Kato ("Kato"). Claims 12-13 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Japanese Patent Application No. 11-312044A to Mitsumi Electric Co. ("Mitsumi"). The Office Action rejected claims 12, 14, 16-17, 19-20, and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by U.S. Patent Application No. 5,049,863 to Oka ("Oka"). Claims 1-3,

5, 7-8, 10-11, and 23-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Oka in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 6,593,859B1 to Watanabe (“Watanabe”). Claims 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Oka in view of Watanabe, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 5,574,481 to Lee (“Lee”). Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims 1-26 are allowable.

### **Independent Claim 1**

Independent claim 1 is directed to a wireless computer keyboard configured for wireless communication with a computer comprising, *inter alia*, a remote control portion configured to functionally operate a graphical user interface, the remote control portion having a set of remote control keys including a first cluster of transport control keys, a second cluster of source control keys, and a graphical user interface key. The recent amendments simply clarify the previously recited remote control portion.

In view of the clarifications, Kato does not teach or suggest all the elements of the invention in claim 1. For example, the Office Action appears to equate the previously recited “remote control portion being disposed laterally from the alphanumeric section” with the attachable and detachable remote control device in Kato (Kato Abstract). Kato fails to teach or suggest the recited remote control portion of claim 1. Similarly, no combination of Oka and Watanabe teaches or suggests the remote control portion as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 as amended is allowable.

### **Independent Claim 12**

Independent claim 12, as amended, is directed to a computer keyboard comprising, *inter alia*, a keyboard housing adapted to maintain a group of alphanumeric keys accessible for user

interaction and a keyboard housing having a receiving portion adapted to bidirectionally communicate with and receive a remote control body having a set of remote control keys therein. Neither Kato, Mitsumi, nor Oka teach or suggest bidirectional communication between the recited keyboard and recited remote control body. At best, Kato and Oka disclose unidirectional communication. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 as amended is allowable.

#### **Independent Claim 19**

The recitation of independent claim 19 is clarified to specify that the claimed remote control includes a first cluster of transport keys, a second cluster of source keys, and a graphical user interface key. Oka, alone or in any combination with Watanabe, does not teach or suggest the specified keys. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 19 is allowable.

#### **Independent Claim 23**

The invention of claim 23 recites a wireless keyboard system. Among other features, neither, Oka and Watanabe, alone nor in any combination, teaches or suggest the recited wireless keyboard system having feature of a remote control processor for operating a graphical user interface. The remote control processor being disposed within the remote control body and the remote control processor connected to circuitry for wirelessly communicating with a computer, when the remote control body is detached from the keyboard housing and wirelessly communicating with a computer via the keyboard processor, when the remote control body is abutted to the keyboard housing; and the remote control body having remote control keys including a first cluster of transport keys, a second cluster of source keys, and a graphical user interface key, said remote control keys being operatively connected to the remote control

processor for wireless communication with a computer. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 23 is allowable.

### **Dependent Claim 2**

Dependent claim 2 is allowable for at least those reasons that claim 1 is allowable, and further in view of the additional features recited therein. For example, claim 2 clarifies that the remote control portion is removably coupleable with the keyboard housing via a media control interface configured to receive input from the remote control keys. Kato neither teaches nor suggests coupling via a media control interface configured to receive input. At best, Kato shows a mechanical coupling via a rotatable shank and coil spring (Kato, Fig. 5A-5B). None of the other references teaches or suggest the recited features. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 as amended is allowable.

### **Dependent Claim 3**

Dependent claim 3 is allowable for at least those reasons that claim 1 is allowable, and further in view of the additional features recited therein. For example, claim 3 is directed to the computer keyboard of claim 1 wherein the remote control portion is mateable with the keyboard housing and mateable with the keyboard processor for bidirectional communication with the remote control portion. Neither Kato nor Oka and Watanabe, alone or in any combination, teach or suggest the recited features of claim 3, in particular, the recited bidirectional communications. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 as amended is allowable.

### **Remaining Dependent Claims**

Dependent claims 4-11, 13-18, 20-22, and 24-26 are allowable for at least the reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable, and further in view of the additional

features recited therein.


**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in better form for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the below-listed number. If any additional fees are required or if an overpayment has been made the Commissioner is authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 5, 2004

By:

  
Darrell G. Mottley  
Registration No. 42,912

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.  
1001 G Street, N.W.  
Eleventh Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 824-3000